

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

MR. HONORE GERVAIS, M.P.

ON THE

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1910

MR. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, with regard to the many services which have been rendered to Canada by Great Britain, some of which have been mentioned by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), I shall not say much, as I agree with that member on that point. I agree also that Canada owes a debt of gratitude to England for these services that have been rendered her in the last hundred years. With regard to the third question which has been raised by the hon. member, the question of the kind of contribution that Canada should give to England, I ask the hon. member for Grenville to agree with me in the position I take and which I shall explain as I proceed. Canada, as I shall show, is ready to grant to England the kind of aid that has been agreed upon between Canada and England. With these few remarks, I proceed to explain the vote that I intend to give on this Bill (No. 95).

Mr. Speaker. I took a great deal of interest, in the debate which took place in this House in March last, upon the resolution concerning the aid to be given

to Great Britain for the strengthening of the British navy. It is now proposed that Canada should take a step further in that direction, and the government asks parliament to crystallize that resolution, and give it effect by the passage of this legislation entitled 'an Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada'; and a subsequent resolution providing for the expenditure necessary for the establishment of that service. By the 53 clauses of this Bill, the government will be empowered to organize a permanent volunteer naval force, at its expense, the ships to be built in Canada, manned and commanded by Canadians, or commanded by officers appointed by Canada, to defend Canada, first, and assist England in its defence, in case of need, under the command in chief of the King, as is required by the political status of this Dominion.

Sir, let me explain some of the many reasons for which this Bill should be passed:

During the recess of parliament a rather lengthy conference between the representatives of the British government, and of the self-governing colonies was held in

London to determine the kind of aid that should be given to England. This conference was the natural outcome of previous meetings held between some of the British ministers and the representatives of the most important of the three classes which we find amongst the 80 colonies or possessions under the sovereignty of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The universal policy of the world is shaping itself towards the supplanting of territorial, or local, or internal trade, by a general or universal trade, or in other words a maritime commerce.

The government is to-day, asking the representatives of this country in this House assembled, to declare themselves on the programme which they are presenting for the creation of a naval defence in connection with the large maritime trade which Canadian merchants are building up. As a representative of the most important city of Canada, the commercial metropolis, and the greatest national port of the Dominion, I cannot give a silent vote upon this great issue.

I owe it to my constituents of the city of Montreal, and I owe it to myself to explain, through what process of personal reflection, through what conception and reasoning, I have, freely, independently from all passing pressure and unlinked to any superior influence, formed my opinion upon the plan which the government has submitted to us.

I do not expect to satisfy the expectations of everybody with my declarations and my vote, but, I at least, hope that, those who after mature reasoning, while not thinking as I do, will feel bound to admit that, in so doing, I have nothing in view but the welfare and greatness of my country.

Allow me then, Sir, to indulge in a brief retrospect of the work and progress of some of the great empires of the past, and the greatness of which was based on their maritime trade. Some of my hon. friends have already quoted from the lessons of the past, and I have listened to their statements with great pleasure; because the past will always be for mankind the best teacher. In anything we do, whatever may be our differences, divisions and strifes, we are nevertheless bound to seek, in the past, for our safest methods to solve the problems of the present. History there teaches us that the greatest and the richest and the happiest nations have been those which gave the best of their energies and wealth to the building and maintenance of a great maritime commerce, through the equipment of both a merchant fleet and a war fleet. Allow me to remind you briefly of the best illustrations, which occur to me, of the soundness of my views. Athens, Lacedaemon, Crete, Lesbos, Chios,

and all the Greek cities and colonies, were nonentities in the political world until, through a skilful and costly combination of forces, money and ships, and under the guidance of an Athenian admiral (if I am permitted to use a modern term to designate its commander) they put to sea a fleet, powerful enough to repulse Asiatic barbarians and other foes. So long as, but not one minute longer, than they had the most powerful fleet, the Greeks were the governing political leaders of the ancient world. Greece was at its political zenith between the time of the battle of Salamis, and that of Aegospotamos, which are the Alpha and Omega of their political and commercial pre-eminence. Rome was a second-class power before the battle of Antium, or, so long as the Romans could not send vessels to conquer Carthage and Asia Minor, and could not rule on the sea as they did on land. During the feudal ages, Venice and Genoa were the supreme arbiters of politics in Europe, just because they were the undisputed masters of the Mediterranean. The most prosperous cities of Europe, during the 400 years from the 12th to the 16th century, were the eighty free towns, holding meetings of their delegates, every three years, either at Lubeck, or Cologne, or Hamburg, for the purpose of assessing the contribution of each town, of securing new trading privileges, and of better defending both old and new ones. Neither a monarchical state, nor a polyarchical state ever enjoyed a greater amount of respect, of prestige from the other monarchies or republics, than those eighty cities composing that quasi-state known, as the Hanseatic League. I contemplate with wonder the enormous waste of human energies and wealth which went to create, upon the ruins of the empire of Venice, that other great Portuguese empire, which was the ruler of the world during the 15th century, just after the discovery of the route to the orient via the Cape of the Tempests, to use the description of Camoens. And then, upon the partition of the unknown world by Pope Nicholas V, in 1454, and Alexander VI in 1493, Spain reached out for America, and astonished Europe by the vastness and richness of her new discoveries. Spain reigned supreme in Europe, during the 16th century. The Netherlands got the monopoly of the trade of the world, during the 17th century, through the audacity, activity and devotion of its mariners. France, during the 18th century, was the arbiter of the maritime destinies of the world, and it was not until then that she was recognized as the dominating political power in Europe.

England came, after Trafalgar, to become as she remains to-day, the ruling state of the world, just because of the indisputable supremacy of her fleet. But, to-day, other

states are organizing merchant fleets, and as a direct consequence, war fleets. Our age will witness the competition of a number of maritime states for the trade supremacy of the world. There are to-day thirty states out of forty-eight going into the maritime trade, and the destinies of the world can no longer rest under the power of a single state. The world's richness is no more to be the easy field of exploitation by a nation having a few thousand daring mariners protecting a great many more thousands of thrifty factors, merchants, traders and shippers. Every state seems ready to send its young men and even its older citizens to conquer the wealth of the unexplored, or undeveloped countries. A universal thirst for business and its profits, for gold, is manifest in every quarter. And in every state there is—and it is quite natural—a tendency to equip on the seas, a fleet of both merchantmen and warships to defend its interests; the one cannot go without the other. States of to-day are getting more and more commercialized and are preparing themselves to compete for the partition of the universal wealth of the world. But such competition, while it may be friendly at the start, must prove eventually hostile. After the tariff wars, one may easily foresee the wars in which predominance is to be determined by the guns of warships. England is confronted to-day with such a condition of affairs, and Canada cannot longer ignore the situation. The so-called German war scare is but one of them, though I must remind you, Sir, that amongst German officers to-day it is customary to offer a toast to 'The Next Meeting,' meaning on board of the first captured English battleship.

It is at this turning point in the life of England and Canada, that we are invited to consider the possibility of future political difficulties. To make Canada ready for any emergency, several policies are proposed. What are they? The first is: the presentation of two Dreadnoughts now, and then, resting on our oars to await adequate results from an unknown policy of defence. The exponent of the policy is the honourable the leader of the opposition. The second is: Canada is to play the 'manly part,' and very naturally its sponsor is the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The third proposed is to do nothing until a plebiscite is had, with a declaration of unalterable devotion to the British Crown as an assurance policy; and, according to the words of that official publication of the late Mr. Hansard, its father is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who, after a six months' canvass, has found a few thousand persons, mostly youths, out of 2,000,000 in the province of Quebec, to support his views. Under the fourth head may be classified ten or twelve other varied and variable

policies, that I beg leave not to expound, as they are mostly founded upon newspaper quotations, poetical recitations, and historical misapplication. Are all those plans as clear and terse and patriotic as that of the government? I venture to say, Sir, they are not. The first two policies are undefinable, impractical and, therefore, negligible. The third one is illogical and illegal, as it is a denial to this House, acting upon a five-years' mandate, of the right to spend one-thirtieth of the revenues of Canada for its defence, when this House might if it chose waste the whole revenue in buying peanuts. That proposition is antiparliamentary; it is useless, public opinion on that question being well known; it is dangerous because it is of such a nature as to create a conflict between Canada and the metropolis. The cabinet, in order to meet the wishes of England, now proposes to this parliament to vote an expenditure of \$12,000,000 to build ships once and for all, and to pay for their maintenance yearly, something less than \$4,500,000. This, therefore, means a yearly expenditure of one and one third million dollars for maintaining and manning ships, the construction of which has cost \$4,000,000.

The purpose of the government plan is obviously to provide a plan of defence for Canada and of help to England, according to the wishes, amounting almost to demands of the latter, which I take to be expressed, conclusively, in the reports of the Naval Defence Conference of 1909, and the circumstances surrounding the same. Canada cannot reasonably refuse the parliament of England itself to express such a desire.

Now, Sir, should we resist these desires of England? I have waited, a long time, before giving my very modest view about the solution of this problem, for a great political and economical problem it undeniably is. I say at once, that it is a question to be decided, not according to race, nor religion, nor historical prejudices, but according purely and simply to the teaching of reason, of law, and of devotion to the best interests of our dear country. To begin with, I must, according to my mind, explain the political status of Canada, in relation to the foreign states of the world, and to England, and the definition of that status will go a great way to show that Canada is not free to reject the requests of England. I must say, that I do not agree with most of the speeches, writings and editorials, which have been written, during the last half century about the great amount of independence enjoyed by Canada. I admit that England has been good enough, during that long period, to let our authors, newspapermen, and orators, tell the people of Canada that they were perfectly free and independent of England,

and that they were their own masters, both in regard to England, and the other states. This, according to my mind, has been a rather equivocal statement of the position which Canada occupies to-day, both in relation to England, and to the other states. I know it is rather hard and humiliating to say those things to my fellow-citizens, but just the same I feel bound to say it for the purpose of pointing out what is the duty of Canada to-day with regard to the request which is being made upon her by England to assist her in the coming commercial battle. I venture to state that Canada, in this year of 1910, according to the teaching of international law, is simply a province of the British empire, having no status whatever with regard to foreign states. Our country does not possess any of the characteristics (which number eight or ten altogether), of what is called state, and which make an aggregation of people irresponsible to any human power, but—to use a phrase of the fifteenth century—'Responsible only to God.' If I examine the classification of states, I am forced to admit that our country is neither a sovereign state, like England; nor a semi-sovereign state, like Bulgaria was; nor a neutral state, like Belgium, nor a state under protectorate like Tunis; nor even a tributary state like Egypt. Comparison of conditions is here of a great benefit to teach our citizens the truth about their reduced political rank in the eyes of the world. With a political organism subject to the caprices of the parliament at Westminster; without power to make its territories productive by foreign trade; without jurisdiction to pass undefeasible laws; unable to protect its citizens abroad before judicial or administrative authorities; unable to ask for marks of respect; unable to send diplomatic agents; unentitled to foreign recognition; incapable of making treaties, unable, unless authorized to do so, to issue letters patent of command either to army officers or to navy officers even to defend her own territory; here stands Canada to-day, calling herself a nation. By telling my fellow-citizens what we really are, I hope I may convey to them the aspiration of being what they might be. While I am making a rather poor picture of the personality of Canada to-day, I am bound to think that this naval move will tend to increase tremendously the importance of our country, and that is why I am in favour of the passing of this Bill.

Canada to-day has not even the right to speak to a minister of foreign affairs, even through her Prime Minister, unless the latter has been clothed with a letter patent issued by the British Minister of Foreign Affairs. So much so, is this, that during the negotiations of the Franco-Canadian treaty, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, and the

Hon. Mr. Brodeur, had to be authorized very minutely by England to speak to the Minister of Trade and Commerce of France, and had to be introduced to the latter by the British Ambassador, in Paris. Let me cite, as the only fact which gives to Canada, what may be styled a recognition by a foreign power, that clause of the Franco-Canadian treaty which allows an employee appointed by Canada to certify bills of lading, or certificates of origin of goods, which may have a legal value. That is about the limit of the action of our country in relation to foreign countries.

I apologize for reminding the House that but a few weeks ago, the Canadian agent in Antwerp had to haul down his sign marked 'Canadian Agency' at the request of the British consul in that city, under the pretense that such action on behalf of the Canadian agent would create possible confusion in the minds of the citizens of Belgium as to the political status of Canada. Canada has no flag, if we do not accept as such the emblem which our merchantmen were some years ago empowered to unfurl at their mastheads. And I do not need to argue very long to show that of international status Canada has none, because the very name of our country 'Dominion,' which our French translators have very proudly, but in properly, translated into the word 'puissance,' should remind us that we are but a domain of the Crown; to use the language of the Act of 1834, defining the powers of the Privy Council of England, and giving to that final tribunal an unlimited jurisdiction over any judgment given by any court in any colony, 'Dominion,' or plantation of His Majesty. In a general way, I could point out many other cases of deception arising out of our political and administrative termino.

If we examine now the status of Canada under the light of the public law of England, what do we discover? One finds that, though a delegation of powers, a federal legislative body, and nine provincial legislatures are supervising private intercourse between our citizens, the application of the civil laws of France, or the common law of England, the appointment of judges to decide litigations arising out of about 20 contracts, and finally looking over the administration of municipal affairs. No constitutional guarantee, in the constitutional Act of 1867, is to be found limiting the power of Great Britain to impose taxes upon its citizens in Canada. If we look at sections 91 and 92 of that Act, we find that even our power to naturalize British subjects is very limited, because our naturalized British subjects are considered as such exclusively within the territory of Canada, and they are not British subjects within the British Isles, nor even in any British colony outside of Canada. If we examine

the statutes of England, we find quite a number of Acts applicable to Canada, and no concern is taken whether they be repugnant or not to the wording of our Canadian statutes. Let me quote, for example, the Colonial Prison Act, the Colonial Offenders' Act, the Colonial Marriage Act, the Colonial Fortification Act, the Colonial Courts Act, the Colonial Clergy Act, the Colonial Attorney' Act, the Colonial Laws Act, the Naturalization Act, the Merchant Shipping Act, the Bills of Exchange Act, and last but not least, the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, 28-29 Victoria, chapter 63, which declares that any law passed by any legislature which is repugnant to the interests of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is ipso facto, null and void. It is to comply with the requirements of that Act, that clause 18 of the Bill before the House has been inserted. Our fleet must remain at the disposal of England in case of emergency or otherwise this Bill will be ultra vires and null and void. Let me quote from the Act of 1865:

The term 'colony' shall in this Act include all of Her Majesty's possessions abroad in which there shall exist a legislature. The term 'legislature' and 'colonial legislature' shall severally signify the authority other than the imperial parliament on His Majesty in Council, competent to make laws for any colony. Any colonial law which is or shall lie in any respect repugnant to the provisions of any Act of parliament extending to the colony to which such law may relate, or repugnant to any law, order or regulation made under the authority of such Act of parliament, or having in the colony the force and effect of such Act, shall be read subject to such Act, order or regulation, and shall to the extent of such repugnancy, but not otherwise, be null and remain absolutely null and void.

Let me quote section 15 of the British North America Act:

The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

The fleet of a State forms part of its public domain, like its rivers, its roads and its forts. Such domain, contrary to its private domain, is always inalienable.

After reading this Bill and the Acts of 1867 and 1861, every one must admit that this extends rather than restricts the autonomy of Canada. The famous question about the meaning 'shall' or 'may' in this legislative enactment, is reduced to naught.

Let me quote also clause 18 of Bill (No. 95) in which the interpretation of the word 'may' has given rise to such debate:

18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and

the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

Should this Bill now before us be passed without clause 18 it would be repugnant to section 5 of that imperial statute, the British North America Act, 1867, conforming to chapter 6, statute 1, Chas. II, 1661, intitled, 'An Act declaring the sole right of the militia to be in the King and for the present ordering and disposing the same,' and also to the regulations made thereunder, and for that very reason our Bill would be null and void. It is not also the proper time to remind this House that nobody but a pirate, and with all the due consequences thereof, can run a warship unless her commander is the bearer of a state patent since the declaration of Paris in 1856. Bill (No. 95) without its clause 18 would be enacted in violation of international law.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my remarks before recess, I may say that many other facts and Acts of parliament could be quoted to show that Canada, after all, and in spite of the Act of 1867, is still, in the eyes of England, one of its 80 provinces. I say this, although Canada has a responsible government, having the right to spend the money of its citizens for their benefit generally without too much interference on behalf of the sovereign authority. I say this although Canada is a British colony of the first class, and is not in consequence a Crown colony, which later is ruled by a governor and a council appointed by England. I say this, although Canada is not a privileged chartered colony, that is, a colony governed by a commercial company. I say all this, Sir, though I am ready to applaud our distinguished leader when he proclaims that Canada is a nation.

While helping England, I prefer to see Canada doing so as a British dominion, realizing thoroughly her present status, than to see Canada rendering such service as a so-called member of an empire, composed of one state and a great number of conquered but statuteless provinces having no representatives in the imperial parliament. It is only by knowing what his present condition is that one may think of reaching a higher condition. I like the idea of Canada entering into a maritime league with England, such as would be in process of creation through this Bill, and which would tend to bring to Canada a larger amount of true autonomy, which would redound to the benefit of England and of Canada.

By the passing of this Bill, Canada is promoting herself to a higher place in the eyes of the world, and that is a very good reason for me to give it my cordial support.

I admit that the status of Canada as a British colony is far better than that of any colony of France, Germany, Portugal, Holland, or even of the United States of America, for in the case of all of those colonies the sovereign state deals with their municipal or local affairs from its legislature without consulting the people of the colony. England alone allowed her colonists to tax her exported goods; to produce goods similar to her own; to sell goods to foreigners or buy from them; to ship them even in non-English bottoms; to be governed by the rules of metropolitan justice. But, it is true, just the same, that Canada is bound, whether it pleases her or not, to do what England may require her to do. Should England wish to tax Canada there is nothing in the public law of England to prevent her. I may be reminded that we have the precedent of the London merchants; but let me tell you, Sir, that those merchants, at that time, were probably equipped to accept the inevitable consequences of resisting the new tax on their tea. Such is not the condition of Canada to-day. Are we to follow the teaching of a certain portion of the press and the speeches of certain of our orators who have been preaching that Canada should have no army and no navy, but should remain as it has been for 150 years, completely without defence, and exclusively inhabited by farmers, merchants, lawyers, and ward heelers, depending solely for protection on the application, for the benefit, of that fiction or hallucination known as the Munroe doctrine.

I know that Canada is not, to-day, governed, as she was upon the arrival of Lord Durham at Quebec. It would be rather difficult for the colonial office of to-day to send to our Governor General instructions similar to those which they sent to Sir Poulett Thompson, and to tell him to govern his country against, or without the advice of his responsible ministers. I know that a radical change has taken place. I know that now the Prime Minister is much more than a sub-officer of Downing street. I know that Canada, since 1791, or to be more accurate, since 1840, has passed from the status of 'Crown' colony to that of responsibly governed colony. I admit, also, that this has been done in consequence of the new policy adopted by England, by which she feels herself in duty bound to grant her colonies autonomy in matters municipal. I am ready to proclaim, that England alone has stood the first, and perhaps will stand

the last, in the history of the colonial regimes of the world, for the establishment of such colonial autonomy as our own, but on the other hand, if I scrutinize the text of our constitution, without taking into account our de facto position towards England, but exclusively our de jure relations with her, I venture to affirm that I make no misstatement of law when I declare that Canada is, legally, but a British colony, and not a nation, in the sense implied by the authors of international law. Sir, we know the meaning of the word 'race', of the word 'people', of the word 'nation', of the word 'state'. Too often, have we in this country lost sight of the true definition of each of those words. Let me define a nation: A nation, Sir, is the union into a society of the inhabitants of one country, having the same language, governed by the same laws, banded together by identity of origin, of physical conformation and of moral propensities, by a community of interests and of feelings and by a merger of existences brought about by the passing of centuries.

I am mentioning all this to show that though England has not been pressing hard upon us to give her help, and has been trying to veil the exercise of her rights upon Canada, she has without any question authority to command Canada to come to her rescue, willingly or unwillingly. But, Sir, not only our status forces us to build up a navy, but our own interests, both political and commercial, impel us to do so, as I will try to show later on.

Sir, are there any real reasons for Canada not doing anything to comply with the wishes of England? A few of our citizens are trying to raise, or rather, to invoke the question of neutrality. Let me explain what is neutrality, as defined by Martens, Klüber, Heffter, Wheaton, Hubner, Hautefeuille and Ortolan. Neutrality is for a state the right or the duty not to take any part in a war. Under international law, neutrality is permissible in favour of any state. One of the most celebrated cases of neutrality was that urged by the United States of America in 1795 when, France being assailed by quite a number of European powers, the United States answering Mr. Genet, the French minister, told him that they were not bound to do anything for France, which had been very recently the most potent instrument in bringing them into the society of states. That resort to neutrality has been invoked, for 150 years, quite a number of times. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that behind the most of the instances of optional neutrality, you find national suicide, or national cowardice.

If we look at the relations between Britain and one of her provinces, there cannot be any question of neutrality, and the rea-

son for this statement is rather obvious. Every law student knows it. Every one knows that so soon as war is declared between England and any of the 45 foreign states of the world, composing the society of states, any inch of the British territory, whether within the British Isles, or in any of the British provinces, is on a war footing. Therefore Canada is at war whether she wishes to be at war or not. England's war is Canada's war, so much so that the minute war is declared all our goods and vessels and citizens become hostile in the estimation of the country at war with England, and all things Canadian become ipso facto seizable by the belligerents against England. Is it not by applying those well-known doctrines, that during the eighteenth century, England saw her way clear to destroy the colonial dominions of France in every part of the world, and to conquer even Nouvelle-France? Those same doctrines stand just as good to-day as in the past, Sir, and it is against the revival of this doctrine to our detriment, that I wish to have my Canadian fellow citizens keep themselves prepared. A state may be neutral; a British province cannot. More especially do I not wish to see Canada standing neutral towards England for the sake of not building a navy. Neutrality is a word which only states can use, but never a colony when addressing its metropolis. But if such a condition of affairs from the point of view of international law and of the public law of England exists, is it not better that Canada should willingly aid England, and do it in the happiest way?

After all, what is asked from Canadians? If we take for granted that the total population of Canada is about 8,000,000, I figure that the contribution of each citizen for the maintenance of our fleet (an accomplishment which will satisfy our national pride, and at the same time please England), will not exceed 60 cents per head annually, plus one dollar and a half per head for the building of the same. If we take into consideration the population of the province of Quebec, and make certain allowances for contributions made more especially for creating banks, insurance companies, loan companies, railway companies, all of them mostly organized and kept in existence by British capital, we have to conclude that, estimating the population of that province at about 2,000,000, each inhabitant of Quebec would not pay more than one shilling per year for the maintenance of that fleet, though so useful both to Canada and England, as well for defence as for commercial purposes.

But, some one may say that this creation of a war fleet will tend to diminish our rank both amongst the colonies of Great Britain, and in the esteem of foreign countries. Nothing can be more fallacious.

I do not see in what way the status of Canada will suffer depreciation because she enters into somewhat of a maritime league with other colonies, and the parent state. No one can imagine for a moment that Canada can alone protect her vast seashores. Let me give you an illustration. I will once more go to the ancient world to get my example. You know that it was the fundamental maxim of Athens that she should remain the ruler of the seas. Athens was the greatest sea power of the 300 cities of Greece. Sparta was the largest military power on land. Nevertheless, Athens, with its 30,000 soldiers, its 40,000 mariners, and its total male and female population of 200,000 inhabitants, managed to form a confederation which was called the confederation of Delos, composed of 300 cities, each one of them sending its delegates, furnishing ships, money or men, and later on paying a fixed sum of money, the whole to equip and maintain a fleet strong enough to secure the supremacy of Greece over all other powers, at any time. The federal treasury which was established first, at Delos, where the delegates met, was later on transferred to Athens, and set up in the Temple of the Acropolis. This is, I think, a shining example to our citizens. Imagine a city like Athens, with a total population of but 200,000 citizens, having its two ports of Piræus and Phalerum, and its shipbuilding yard of Munychia, and contributing half of the thousand talents, that is \$5,000,000 for the equipment and manning of the confederation fleet. And, you know, Athens did the right thing in regard to that; as long as the maritime league was maintained, her glory was unimpaired, as soon as it was disrupted all her power vanished. Neither Athens nor Lacedæmon felt depreciated by going into the confederation of Delos. For Athens had not then forgotten the teaching of Themistocles and Aristides, realizing that their country needed not only magistrates and leaders, but also, instruments of defence such as an army, a fleet of war, and a revenue. Athens has given to the world of to-day the most vivid example of national energy. With a small territory, and a limited budget, through the efforts and ability of its public spirited citizens (the greatest lovers of liberty known to history) Athens was able to make first class harbours, build the strongest navy of the day, erect the most marvellous temples and palaces that art can inspire and architecture construct, and through its fleet, and its naval defence demonstrate her capabilities in repulsing invasions much more terrible for her than would be an invasion to-day of England by the Germans.

After this short glimpse of the past, let us come to the question of the protection of our thousands of miles of seashore and territorial boundary. First of all, we have

to consider the proposal of those who wish a Canada unarmed, both on sea and land, but who hope to substitute for them the British protection which it has enjoyed for years; the protection which is called by those who are not farsighted, the Monroe doctrine, and which is in a concrete form the recognition of the United States of America as the protector, the tutor, and the guardian of the twenty-one states of North, Central, and South America. The establishment of that Monroe doctrine, as a settled fact is contrary to the best interests of the world, as well as to the teaching of the society of states. There is but one, there can be but one, universal society of states. The Monroe doctrine has not proved itself, as you know, Sir, very useful to the lesser states of America. Mexico, which sought for the application of the Monroe doctrine to dethrone the Emperor Maximilian, lost through it, the best part of its territory. Mexico was deprived of her valleys and of her plains and she was left with but her mountains. The application of the Monroe doctrine too, in the case of Cuba, has proved very detrimental to the richest island of the West Indies. The secret conspiracy to destroy the sugar crops and the tobacco crops of Cuba and to create revolution against Spain, all things inspired by Monroe doctrine advocates, has brought, as its natural consequence the reduction of Cuba to a state of humiliating protection, and Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands to a still more inferior condition.

The intervention of our neighbours in the private affairs of the states of both central and south America, is not of a nature to encourage our country to place its future national aspirations under the protection of the Monroe doctrine. We are suffering enough just now, from the use by our neighbours of a name, though chosen by them at a Paris banquet, given in the honour of Franklin, which goes to show that our friends of the United States of America are arrogating to themselves alone the right to the name of Americans which should really designate all the groups of inhabitants of the whole continent. American invasion under a peaceful name has already set in, I regret to say. Very fortunately the other states have not yet recognized that abusive use of a name by the United States of America, which after all is but one of the forty-eight states of the world. Surely it is a most absurd dream to believe in the protection of the Monroe doctrine rather than in British protection.

Anything which will tend to loosen or to destroy our ties with the parent state is, in my opinion, an act of high treason towards our country, because it would mean for her a *Diminutio Capitis*, that is to say, a reduction of rank in the eyes of the world. Canada left to herself, without any

more British protection, would be open to be annexed to our neighbours, or to be sold to them, by her sovereign. We have to speak plainly; do you imagine, for a moment, that England, not receiving even the moral support or any co-operation in its defence from Canada, would do anything to protect the latter from an American or other foreign invasion? I have taken for granted, at this moment, that England would not try to coerce its colony of Canada. But it is within, as we have said, the power of England to resort to such coercion by way of taxation, threats of sale or exchange of territory, as in the case of Heligoland for Samoa, and the purchase of our territory would have an easy job to get possession of it. For, if those who do not wish our parliament to put up any defence should succeed in convincing our people of the correctness of their foolish opinions, Canada would be utterly unprotected both on sea and on land, and liable to be conquered by a border invasion. What are words of mouth worth against the bullet of the fusileer or the baton of the constable? I beg some of my Quebec friends to remember the days of 1837, when words, newspaper articles, and epistles from those having brought about the resort to arms, and who were keeping themselves in hiding in foreign lands, proved unequal to prevent my fellow-men from dying either on the battlefield or on the scaffold. Sir, I do not like to speak of those dire possibilities, should the opinion of those in my province who want an undefended Canada, prevail. Suppose that England inflicting chastisement, should disinterest herself of Canada; then in the case of annexation, for example, what would be the result for our church, our laws, and our language. Has any one thought of such a possibility? The treaty guarantees of 1763 would exist no more with regard to the use of our language, or the enjoyment of our civil laws, or with regard to the Catholic church, which would surely lose the privileges so long enjoyed by her. Surely, those institutions of ours, which are so dear to us all, would be in imminent danger, since say two senators, and four congressmen would represent the province of Quebec, provided—which is not certain—that the American states would accord the dignity of statehood to each of the provinces of Canada. However, it is quite possible that no such recognition of existing political divisions would take place, and that Canada would be governed by laws passed in Washington, without our having adequate representation there. I do not see why, if Canada, being either abandoned, or even sold or exchanged by England to the United States, the latter should not consider our country in the very same light as Porto Rico, and the Philip-

pine Islands. Would the United States of America give any consideration to a defenceless, and a friendless Canada? Sir, no power would give consideration to a country defended by hustling trumpeters, pamphleteers, and self-styled newspaper-office peers. Surely no Canadian patriot will admit for a moment that such a change in the political life of Canada, that is to say annexation, would not be tantamount to political slavery.

I pray my fellow-citizens, not to trust our great hustings trumpeters, our pamphleteers, or our self-constituted editorial peers, for either defence or diplomacy. I refrain from dwelling upon the possible realization of such a nightmare, for I am too thoroughly convinced that our citizens would prefer death to the consequence of refusing to part with 25 cents a year each for the construction and maintenance of our navy as is proposed by the government. Sir, I prefer to be the son of a conquered freeman than the son of a self-constituted slave; for, as I look at it, I consider that for Canada to seek protection in the Monroe doctrine, is to constitute herself the slave of a power whose rule is getting more and more unbearable to all. The idea of moving towards providing for the defence of Canada, combined with effort towards the extension of her commerce, is surely an inspiration. Let the building of a navy proceed if only to prevent annexation.

Let us now examine the question of Britain's neglect of our interests, which was raised the other night, by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He charges England with having given away to the United States a strip of land which is equal to the territory of many states; he also charges England with having sacrificed our interests in the Alaska boundary arbitration case. I will not discuss, at any great length, the correctness of the statement of the hon. member. There is, no doubt, a great deal of truth in it, but I must remind the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that Canada has in this, a great deal of blame to take upon her own shoulders. Even in the case of the Ashburton treaty negotiations, Canada did not say much, when she should at least have raised her voice to keep her own territory. In the Alaska arbitration dispute, perhaps Canada could have better looked to the settlement of that case through the channel of diplomacy. We must also admit that in 1834, and later on, in 1852, Canada did not do much to prevent Newfoundland from taking possession, in spite of statutes and treaties; and the possessory rights of the province of Quebec, of that long seashore, which is known to-day as the Newfoundland Labrador.

On the other hand, we are bound to admit, to the credit of England; that the undisputed possession by Canada of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and other gulfs and bays, with their fisheries, as well as the exclusive possession of the St. Lawrence river, as well as the right of navigation in common of the Mississippi river, are some of the great victories secured by England for Canada through the treaties or correspondence of 1784, 1818, 1826, 1854, and subsequent treaties or agreements. Is it not England who brought the United States to consider all the bays, straits and gulfs of Canada's King's Chambers, bounded in accordance with the head line doctrine; thus securing for Canada millions of miles of rich maritime territory. Sir, if England has neglected the interests of Canada, I do believe that Canada has not done all she should have done to protect her own interests.

A very good way for Canada to protect herself now, as she has not done much in that direction, in the past, is to build up what may be styled the beginning of a navy; to make the appointment of commercial agents; to look herself after her own commercial affairs; to do all that is necessary to satisfy England; and to try to get in return a freer hand in the management of her own business. The argument is advanced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that because England has given away some portion of our territory, we should do nothing for England, and, remaining passive allow the balance of the assets of Canada to be taken by anybody wishing the possession of them. This is, after all, the conclusion we have to come to if we follow the advice of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I do not see any patriotism in holding such a view. Smaller states, with less population, have performed marvels in defending themselves and have spent a great deal more to defend their country than Canada would do by voting a yearly expenditure of four and a half million dollars.

Without looking at the eight first-rank maritime powers, we find that some small states, like Uruguay, with a population not exceeding 2,000,000, has five warships. Chili, with a population of about 4,000,000 has nevertheless 15 warships. The Argentine Republic, with a population of about 6,000,000, has about 40 warships, some of them of the latest type.

Take the case of Sweden and Norway; take the case of Italy which is doing a smaller amount of trade than Canada—all these states, because they know that there is wealth in the maritime trade, and that there cannot be any maritime trade without vessels of war to defend it, are ready to spend generous portions of their in-

come to build the means of protection of their money-making instrument, their merchant shipping.

According to certain newspaper men, and a few platform speakers in our country, because Canada has boasted herself the fifth commercial country and the sixth maritime trader of the world, and all this through the protection and prestige of England without paying anything for that protection, she finds herself, to-day, in a terrific condition of mind, because England proposes to her to spend a little portion of her wealth for the maintenance of that profitable condition of affairs. That reminds me of the case of a son who had been doing business for his own benefit with the money and through the prestige of his father, and who, upon the death of the latter, wanted to sue his estate for damages caused by the loss of said prestige. Sir, no group of men can call themselves a nation without assuming responsibilities and risking sacrifices. This is the gist of the reason why the idea of a state implies such a degree of prestige and admiration everywhere and in all times. It is because it means that a number of men, more or less great, have worked, suffered and died for the creation, the final establishment, of a common national ideal. A group of men, who are fond of calling themselves a nation, must be also ready to build a navy for defence. Now, coming to the question of the pecuniary advantages to Canada of standing by Great Britain, we must admit that such advantages are rather important. Let us consider the interest our country is paying on its public loans—just $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But if we examine the public loans made to foreign countries, we discover at once that the German empire was paying last week four and a fraction per cent on a very important loan. Brazil has just made an issue of debentures, redeemable in gold, sold at 94, with interest at 5 per cent. The Argentine republic borrowed very lately \$50,619,000 at 5 per cent, its bonds being sold at 97. The divers loans of Brazil aggregating \$867,432,500 bear interest at 4 per cent, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and 5 per cent. Uruguay for its loans of 1891, 1895 and 1901, has paid as high as 5 per cent and 8 per cent. If we look up the rate of interest payable by Sweden, Norway, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Italy, we are bound to admit that most, if not all, those foreign states were paying about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent more upon their loans than is Canada upon its \$400,000,000 of funded debt.

This means that our country, through the permanency, the stability, the security of its institutions, its political and social conditions, together with its natural resources, and above all, the prestige of our British connection, is gaining $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent upon its loans, which means a saving of about \$6,000,000. Is it not proper to take half of

that saving to build up a fleet which will at the same time help England to some extent, at any rate, and to organize for our own country a system of defence which may be of very great use in time to come?

Then, if we come to examine the conditions of trade and finance generally in Canada, we discover that our country and its business men, its shippers, its merchants and even its farmers, are deriving great benefit from the good relations existing between England and Canada. Take, for example, the rate of interest on loans to individuals, the rate of insurance, the rate of transportation, the steamer fares, railway fares, and what do you find? The fact is that all those rates are cheaper than in most foreign countries. What is the cause of all this? No one can deny that it is due to the permanency of our commercial and social conditions; but that permanency is in turn due to the permanency and stability of the parent state, and, lastly, the stability and permanency of the parent state are no doubt the consequences of the undisputed and indisputable supremacy of the British fleet.

And what are we paying for the maintenance of that navy which means so great a benefit to Canada? In the past, and until to-day, we have paid nothing. England is asking my fellow countrymen to contribute in the future to the extent of one quarter of a dollar per head. No one, I venture to say, in the province of Quebec, will object to such a little contribution which will prove so beneficial to our country. The credit of Canada is nailed to the topmast of the British navy, I may say. Let this belief be dissipated and within one year the public loan rate of interest will rise from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 8 per cent; and private loan rates of interest will double. When speaking of that feature of our political condition let me dwell upon two topics very pertinent to it.

One may think, and very naturally, that by complying with the requests of the British admiralty, which have been thoroughly explained in previous speeches, Canada will derive some other advantages, especially political advantages. As I said before, our country is enjoying none of the rights which make a country independent or sovereign. One of those rights is that of making treaties. Even during the negotiations of the last Franco-Canadian treaty the conferences practically were held in the name and under the authority of England, this being required because of our condition, from the point of view of international law.

But if Canada wishes to be something in the world she must have conceded to her by England that very important power of negotiating treaties with foreign countries. Is there any better way of getting that favour than to convince England that Can-

ada is ready to do all she can for the maintenance of British prestige throughout the world? The treaty-making power is worth the cost of even a navy. Another very important concession which our country should perhaps seek to obtain would be the concession by England of the right to appoint Anglo-Canadian consuls, that is, men born in Canada or the appointment of such men by England herself upon the special request of Canada. As I said in 1904 in this House, the British consular service is inefficient, according to the statements of the newspapers, and of the greatest parliamentarians of England, such as Sir Edward Grey, Mr. James Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Sinclair, and according also to the general consensus of opinion. Canada is in great need of new openings of trade throughout the world. Those trade openings are still to be found and established; but who are the agents to secure for us these immense benefits? Some one naturally will say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is always there, that is, in Ottawa. But business men will answer that good commercial agents in the field are, to-day, the only men to bring to our shores the many millions of dollars' worth of trade we need. As a matter of fact, we have no trade relations to speak of with South America, we have no line of steamers between Canada and the divers states of South America, we have no commercial agents either in Brazil or the Argentine Republic, nor in most of the twelve or fifteen states of South America, though with each of those states Canada could build up a prosperous trade by direct representation. Our apples, potatoes, butter, cheese, and even our ice, could sell at a very high price in Brazil, where you find a population of over 20,000,000. Our cod, which is caught just off our shores, is not shipped direct to South America, but is sent to Lisbon, where it is cured, and thence reshipped to Brazil under the slang name of bacalia. We could sell South America any amount of vehicles, agricultural implements, wooden structures, and building materials, because the timber of those countries, though precious and for some purposes more valuable than ours, is unfit for constructing wagons, and for most building purposes. There would be no end to the list of profits which could be made through a proper system of commercial agencies of consular status established by Canada in South America and in many other foreign states. As I pointed out in 1904, smaller countries than ours are spending, on an average, half a million of dollars for maintaining consular service, while Canada is doing practically nothing for that purpose. A sum of at least \$1,000,000 should be spent yearly to pay the salaries and expenses of a hundred com-

mercial agents and Anglo-Canadian consuls either appointed from amongst Canadian born, by England herself, or by Canada, upon some special concession granted to the latter. I am ready to say that should our help towards England to-day go to secure for us the appointment of Anglo-Canadian consuls, I would be ready to ask this House to vote per year, not ten, or twenty cents, but \$10 per head, for the establishment of such a system as would undoubtedly improve the commercial relations of Canada, and I would venture to state that as a result the trade of Canada would be three times larger than it is to-day. I speak of this important question of Anglo-Canadian consuls because it is very closely linked to that other question of extension of our external or maritime trade, which will be a new impetus under the escort of our fleet.

But there are many other advantages to Canada in the building of a fleet. It is undeniable that at one time Canada was the greatest ship-building country of America. The maritime trade spirit was alive and progressive. It was natural, because most of its inhabitants are descendants of mariners, they are the offspring of those marvellous sailors, the Norsemen, who discovered America, and started establishments on this continent about sixty years before Christopher Columbus secured for Spain the official paraphernalia necessary to grant her so-called discovery rights. Who does not speak to-day with admiration of the hydrographical school of Dieppe, already famous in the 14th and 15th centuries, and of its professor, Desceliers, who had won renown as far back as 1480, and of his still more celebrated pupil, Jehan Cousin, who in 1488, made a report to the magistrates of Dieppe on his discovery of America? And Vincent Pinzon, Columbus's famed pilot, was he not the same Vincent Pinzon who accompanied Jehan Cousin, and was he not repeating in 1492 the journey which he had made in 1488? We all come, the most of us at least, from those Norsemen, from the stock of Normandy or the British Isles, who have braved the perils of the sea for at least ten centuries. Most of our immediate forefathers have been farming and trading in small towns for a couple of centuries, but, without claiming to be a prophet, I may assure the House that it will not take many years before the sons of farmers and traders and professional men can qualify for the re-conquest of the great seas, the legacy one may say, by the law of nature, of the brave Norsemen of yore. Let us revive the industries of our ancestors.

Let me remind hon. gentlemen of some of the many other advantages to be derived from the building of a fleet. Marine engineering, and the art of navigation, will

receive a very great impetus from the adoption of the proposed plan.

Let me say, Sir, a few words to our students about the advantages they will reap from the building of our navy. The art and science of ship-building will go to a great extent to open new callings in life for the students in our special schools. With regard to those schools, allow me to give a few words of explanation. Let me open a very short chapter about the school system of Quebec that will have some direct connection with the execution of the plan of the government. The students of our schools will have much to do with the construction, the manning, and the maintenance of our merchant and war fleet, for both will have to develop simultaneously. And what about our academy of marine, or naval college, to complete the system of our special schools? Montreal, with its two universities, would be the ideal place to locate a naval college. In no place else in Canada can there be found a better place for a naval college, better professors, more modern laboratories, more valuable libraries and general educational equipment. I must tell the Quebec students, even those who have signed petitions against the passing of this Bill, just four things: That marine engineers occupy the first rank in the engineering world; that marine officers are the most learned and cultured men; that amongst their many intellectual gifts, they must speak many languages, and in every case the French language, which is the language of diplomacy, is that which is spoken by the marine officers of every state of the five continents, so that the building of our navy is a good means of making our French language honoured. While speaking of our Quebec students protesting against the passing of Bill 95, let me ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to present to them a few copies of that new book of Mr. Emile Faguet, 'Le Culte de l'Incompétence,' or lecture them about experimental superiority of older men over young men. It is one of the many good maxims of Nietzsche which he expresses in saying very properly:

A sign of nobility, a sign of aristocracy, such is the respect of youths for older men.

The other day I listened to a lengthy debate in this House about technical schools in Canada. Many things were said about foreign technical schools, but not one word to explain the tremendous progress which has been made in the province of Quebec for the establishment, side by side with its classical schools with their three degrees of efficiency, of a whole set of special schools, which I style a higher commercial school, where the science and art of foreign languages, of precis writing, commercial geography, state finance and

industrial chemistry, and physics, are taught for the purpose of making men able to manage commercial houses, and to promote commercial relations abroad. We have, in the province of Quebec, also established colleges of technology, or technical schools, where the theory of every art, from that of the plumber to that of the jeweller, will be taught by book and laboratory, and where also the practice of each such art will be impressed on the minds of the students by designs, tools, and hand work. Alongside of these, schools of agriculture are already established. At St. Ann's, and at Oka, agricultural experts will be very shortly graduated for the purpose of establishing in nearly every county of the province of Quebec, agricultural laboratories where inspection, examination and analysis of grain can be taught to the farmers; all of which must eventually conduce to the benefit of our export trade. A school of forestry has also been established. The graduates of the school of forestry of Nancy, France, and Harvard, will teach the people of the province of Quebec how to preserve their natural resources and re-afforest their woodland, thus securing the proper amount of moisture necessary to successful agriculture. In addition to these, McGill College and the Polytechnic school, in the teaching of architecture, mining, electric, industrial and civil engineering, provide for our country, skilful engineers of all kinds, to wrest honourable profit from Canada's natural resources. I say this, in passing, for the purpose of showing our students that something is in store for them out of the building of our navy; and also for the purpose of telling the Minister of Labour and the members of the Technical School Commission when they come to inquire into the conditions of technical schools, that if they wish to be properly informed, they would do well to go to Quebec and stop there for a little while, before going elsewhere. It is to the everlasting glory of Sir Lomer Gouin, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, that he has built up a complete system of special schools alongside of the classical schools of that province, which will make of it before twenty years, one of the most learned centres in America.

I have been calling the attention of the House to our educational system, just to show that our would-be gunless and shipless defenders in Quebec are, after all, very neglectful of the interests of our students when they fail to see, or all of them numerous advantages in the realization of the shipbuilding programme. Our graduates are perhaps the best equipped to benefit from the new policy. The construction of a fleet should also be approved of for the sake of our many special school students, who will therein find many and varied em-

ployments and callings. Quite a number of good positions surely will be secured for these students by the establishment of the new marine equipment. Our special school graduates will contribute in some way or other to the construction of the new fleet, and thereby contribute to the enhanced prosperity and greatness of Canada.

There are many other reasons for which I am ready to vote for the passing of this Bill. I will vote for the Bill, because:

1. It will cost but a trifle per head of our population to build a few ships which will help England, satisfy our obligations towards her, and gratify our national pride;

2. The expenditure of a few cents per head, per year, may go to secure for Canada the concession from England of the power of making treaties, of the power to appoint Anglo-Canadian consuls, thereby securing for us benefits which will be at hundredfold greater to Canada than the total of our expenditure to-day;

3. I would rather stand by our parent state than depend upon American protection, I prefer British protection.

4. The building of a fleet will to a great extent help our classical and special school graduates;

5. It is in accordance with the dictum of the public law of England towards Canada, for it is not within the province of the latter to refuse any contribution to help England;

6. The creation of a Canadian navy will to a large extent tend to create for Canada new openings of trade, the establishment of new commercial agencies and negotiations of commercial treaties—three keys to the treasuries of the world;

7. This possession of a fleet is the best and only way to secure progress in peace for our country and to assure its everlasting prosperity.

For all these reasons, and many others, I appeal to this House, and to my constituents of St. James, not to begrudge a shilling a year for the maintenance of the prestige of England, and the enlargement of our national life.

And now, to those unthoughtful enough to close their eyes and stop their ears to the great lessons of history; to those who shout aloud that nothing should be done to defend Canada, to those who are continuously, dangerously, creating agitation, to all those who do not wish to give any kind of aid to England, whether they be representatives of the western grain growers, or agriculturists of Quebec, I would say this: You do not want any naval defence for Canada, you prefer to remain in statu quo, you are afraid of military and naval expenditure, let me remind you of a past which is still the present for us. If Canada, when she was a weak colony under

the French monarchy, had followed the advice, the admonitions and prayers of that incomparable and immortal American statesman of the seventeenth century (though not born in America) Governor Frontenac, who implored France not to reconstruct the marvellous palace of Versailles, but to build a navy, to send soldiers to Nouvelle France, and to equip an army to protect its territory and the entrance of its Gulf of St. Lawrence, never would Wolfe have defeated Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham, and never would it have been possible for England to conquer Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, should we have no navy, what Wolfe was able to do, one Von der Goltz or one Henri de Hohenzollhern, may try to repeat. Canada, being without naval defence, without coast protection, should ever a European conflict hold back the English fleet in the North sea, the entrance of the St. Lawrence would be left undefended against a hostile fleet which would be able to anchor before Montreal with much less risk than in the Baltic sea. Sir, such a possibility should awake in the people of Canada, and more especially in my fellow citizens of Quebec, a strong desire to grant what is asked from them to secure both a defence of our coasts, and a compliance with the wishes of England. My fellow citizens of Quebec, I am sure—and here, I believe, I am expressing their inner sentiments—are ready to stand by England to-day, for we are indebted to England for the fairness with which England has treated us. Should I speak to-night in my own mother language, it would be due to the liberality of England. The Latin and French languages were for hundreds of years the only languages spoken in the mother parliament on the banks of the Thames, in the same way that Greek and Latin had been the official languages of the parliament of Rome. I beg leave to convey to the English speaking citizens of Canada to-night, the assurance that their French speaking friends will stand shoulder to shoulder with them for the maintenance of British institutions in Canada as did, twenty centuries ago, our ancestors, the Gaelic senators when they joined the Roman senators in the defence of the state of Rome.

While I am saying all this, I cannot forbear from denouncing as infamous, the veiled charges of disloyalty which have been and are still being hurled against my compatriots. Sir, Quebec will always remember that beautiful sentiment enunciated by the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada at a Paris banquet in 1905: 'To France, we owe our origin; to England, our liberty.'